

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

ED VALLEJO and BEISA VALLEJO, §
§
Plaintiffs, §
§
V. § No. 3:24-cv-490-E-BN
§
COLDWELL BANKER, ET AL., §
§
Defendants. §

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiffs Ed Vallejo and Beisa Vallejo, husband and wife, who reside in Los Angeles, California, filed a *pro se* complaint in this district, through which they assert violations of 18 U.S.C. § 113 (pertaining to assaults within maritime and territorial jurisdiction); 18 U.S.C. § 351(e) (applicable to assaults on members of Congress and members of Congress-elect, certain executive branch officials and nominees, major candidates for President or Vice-President, and Justices of the United States and nominees); and the California penal code, based on events alleged to have occurred in Los Angeles earlier this year, presumably because the Vallejos allege that one of the defendants is headquartered in Dallas, Texas. *See* Dkt. No. 3.

The Vallejos also move for a temporary restraining order (“TRO”) and court-appointed counsel. *See* Dkt. Nos. 4 & 5.

And United States District Judge Ada Brown referred the Vallejos’ complaint to the undersigned United States magistrate judge for pretrial management under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and a standing order of reference.

After reviewing the complaint, the undersigned questions whether there is subject matter jurisdiction and, given the circumstances of this case, enters these findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendation that the Court should dismiss this action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction (and thereby deny the pending motions without prejudice).

These findings and conclusions provide the Vallejos notice as to the jurisdictional deficiencies. And the ability to file objections to the undersigned's recommendation that this case be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction (as further explained below) offers them an opportunity to establish (if possible) that the Court does have subject matter jurisdiction.

Legal Standards

“Jurisdiction is the power to say what the law is.” *United States v. Willis*, 76 F.4th 467, 479 (5th Cir. 2023). So consideration of “[j]urisdiction is always first.” *Louisiana v. U.S. Dep’t of Energy*, 90 F.4th 461, 466 (5th Cir. 2024) (citation omitted).

And, because “[f]ederal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction,’ possessing ‘only that power authorized by Constitution and statute,’” *Gunn v. Minton*, 568 U.S. 251, 256 (2013) (quoting *Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am.*, 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994)), “subject-matter delineations must be policed by the courts on their own initiative even at the highest level,” *Ruhrgas AG v. Marathon Oil Co.*, 526 U.S. 574, 583-84 (1999) (citations omitted).

The Vallejos chose to file this lawsuit in federal court and, by doing so, undertook the burden to establish federal jurisdiction. *See Butler v. Dall. Area Rapid*

Transit, 762 F. App'x 193, 194 (5th Cir. 2019) (per curiam) ("[A]ssertions [that] are conclusory [] are insufficient to support [an] attempt to establish subject-matter jurisdiction." (citing *Evans v. Dillard Univ.*, 672 F. App'x 505, 505-06 (5th Cir. 2017) (per curiam); *Jeanmarie v. United States*, 242 F.3d 600, 602 (5th Cir. 2001))).

And, if they do not establish federal jurisdiction, this lawsuit must be dismissed. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 12(h)(3) ("If the court determines at any time that it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction, the court must dismiss the action.").

Because federal jurisdiction is not assumed, "the basis upon which jurisdiction depends must be alleged affirmatively and distinctly and cannot be established argumentatively or by mere inference." *Getty Oil Corp. v. Ins. Co. of N.A.*, 841 F.2d 1254, 1259 (5th Cir. 1988) (citing *Ill. Cent. Gulf R. Co. v. Pargas, Inc.*, 706 F.2d 633, 636 & n.2 (5th Cir. 1983)); *see also MidCap Media Fin., L.L.C. v. Pathway Data, Inc.*, 929 F.3d 310, 313 (5th Cir. 2019) ("Because federal courts have limited jurisdiction, parties must make 'clear, distinct, and precise affirmative jurisdictional allegations' in their pleadings." (quoting *Getty Oil*, 841 F.2d at 1259)).

Under their limited jurisdiction, federal courts generally may only hear a case if it involves a question of federal law or where diversity of citizenship exists between the parties. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332.

In cases invoking jurisdiction under Section 1332, each plaintiff's citizenship must be diverse from each defendant's citizenship, and the amount in controversy must exceed \$75,000. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a), (b).

This amount "is determined by the amount of damages or the value of the

property that is the subject of the action.” *Celestine v. TransWood, Inc.*, 467 F. App’x 317, 319 (5th Cir. 2012) (per curiam) (citing *Hunt v. Wash. State Apple Adver. Comm’n*, 432 U.S. 333, 347 (1977)).

And, “[f]or diversity purposes, state citizenship is synonymous with domicile. A change in domicile requires: ‘(1) physical presence at the new location and (2) an intention to remain there indefinitely.’” *Dos Santos v. Belmere Ltd. P’ship*, 516 F. App’x 401, 403 (5th Cir. 2013) (per curiam) (citations omitted); *see also Preston v. Tenet Healthsystem Mem’l Med. Ctr.*, 485 F.3d 793, 797-98 (5th Cir. 2007) (“In determining diversity jurisdiction, the state where someone establishes his domicile serves a dual function as his state of citizenship.... Domicile requires the demonstration of two factors: residence and the intention to remain.” (citing *Stine v. Moore*, 213 F.2d 446, 448 (5th Cir. 1954))); *SXSW v. Fed. Ins. Co.*, 83 F.4th 405, 407 (5th Cir. 2023) (“The difference between *citizenship* and *residency* is a frequent source of confusion.’ For natural persons, § 1332 citizenship is determined by domicile, which requires residency plus an intent to make the place of residency one’s permanent home. An allegation of residency alone ‘does not satisfy the requirement of an allegation of citizenship.’” (emphasis in original; citations omitted)).

“The basis for diversity jurisdiction must be ‘distinctly and affirmatively alleged.’” *Dos Santos*, 516 F. App’x at 403 (quoting *Mullins v. TestAmerica, Inc.*, 564 F.3d 386, 397 (5th Cir. 2009)). And “a ‘failure to adequately allege the basis for diversity jurisdiction mandates dismissal.’” *Id.* (quoting *Stafford v. Mobil Oil Corp.*, 945 F.2d 803, 805 (5th Cir. 1991)).

Under Section 1331, federal question jurisdiction “exists when ‘a well-pleaded complaint establishes either that federal law creates the cause of action or that the plaintiff’s right to relief necessarily depends on resolution of a substantial question of federal law.’” *Borden v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 589 F.3d 168, 172 (5th Cir. 2009) (quoting *Franchise Tax Bd. v. Constr. Laborers Vacation Tr.*, 463 U.S. 1, 27-28 (1983)); *see also In re Hot-Hed Inc.*, 477 F.3d 320, 323 (5th Cir. 2007) (“A federal question exists ‘if there appears on the face of the complaint some substantial, disputed question of federal law.’” (quoting *Carpenter v. Wichita Falls Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 44 F.3d 362, 366 (5th Cir. 1995))).

The “‘creation’ test … accounts for the vast bulk of suits under federal law.” *Gunn*, 568 U.S. at 257 (citation omitted). But

“a federal court [is also] able to hear claims recognized under state law that nonetheless turn on substantial questions of federal law, and thus justify resort to the experience, solicitude, and hope of uniformity that a federal forum offers on federal issues.” That is to say, “federal jurisdiction over a state law claim will lie if a federal issue is: (1) necessarily raised, (2) actually disputed, (3) substantial, and (4) capable of resolution in federal court without disrupting the federal-state balance approved by Congress.”

Perez v. Se. SNF, L.L.C., No. 21-50399, 2022 WL 987187, at *3 (5th Cir. Mar. 31, 2022) (per curiam) (quoting *Grable & Sons Metal Prods., Inc. v. Darue Eng’g & Mfg.*, 545 U.S. 308, 312 (2005), then *Gunn*, 568 U.S. at 258).

Discussion

First, insofar as the Vallejos attempt to establish federal question jurisdiction by invoking federal criminal statutes, “decisions whether to prosecute or file criminal charges are generally within the prosecutor’s discretion,” so, as private citizens, the

Vallejos neither have “standing to institute a federal criminal prosecution [nor the] power to enforce a criminal statute,” *Gill v. State of Tex.*, 153 F. App’x 261, 262-63 (5th Cir. 2005) (per curiam) (citing *Linda R.S. v. Richard D.*, 410 U.S. 614, 619 (1973); *United States v. Batchelder*, 442 U.S. 114, 124 (1979)); *see also Lefebure v. D’Aquilla*, 15 F.4th 650, 654 (5th Cir. 2021) (In *Linda R.S.*, “the Court repeatedly emphasized ‘the special status of criminal prosecutions in our system.’ It is a bedrock principle of our system of government that the decision to prosecute is made, not by judges or crime victims, but by officials in the executive branch. And so it is not the province of the judiciary to dictate to executive branch officials who shall be subject to investigation or prosecution.... As a result, courts across the country have dutifully enforced this rule in case after case – refusing to hear claims challenging the decision not to investigate or prosecute another person.” (collecting cases; citations omitted)).

This lack of standing means that, to the extent that the Vallejos intend to “press [federal criminal] charges” against a named defendant, they may “not assert a valid basis for federal question jurisdiction” by relying “on federal criminal statutes only.” *Robinson v. Pulaski Tech. Coll.*, 698 F. App’x 859 (8th Cir. 2017) (per curiam) (citations omitted).

Relatedly, criminal statutes usually will not create civil liability and therefore provide for subject matter jurisdiction. *See, e.g., Ennis Transp. Co. Inc. v. Richter*, No. 3:08-cv-2206-B, 2009 WL 464979, at *1 (N.D. Tex. Feb. 24, 2009) (“It is well established that generally there is no private cause of action for the violation of a federal criminal statute, and thus no jurisdiction for federal courts to preside over a

suit between private parties when the only federal law allegedly violated is criminal. In rare circumstances, however, where a criminal statute has ‘a statutory basis for inferring’ the existence of a civil action, violation of a criminal statute may give rise to a private cause of action.” (citations omitted).

The Vallejos also have not established diversity jurisdiction under Section 1332, as they fail to properly allege the citizenships of the defendants but also provide enough facts to allow the Court to reasonably infer that each plaintiff’s citizenship is not diverse from each defendant’s citizenship. *See generally* Dkt. No. 3.

These reasons – why the Court should dismiss this lawsuit for lack of subject matter jurisdiction – also reflect that the Vallejos have not shown that a TRO should be granted. *See Barbosa v. Barr*, 502 F. Supp. 3d 1115, 1120 (N.D. Tex. 2020) (“As courts of limited jurisdiction, federal courts must ‘affirmatively ascertain subject-matter jurisdiction before adjudicating a suit.’ ‘A party seeking a TRO cannot establish a “substantial likelihood of success on the merits” of his claim if the court concludes that it lacks jurisdiction to adjudicate the claim altogether.’” (quoting *Nianga v. Wolfe*, 435 F. Supp. 3d 739, 743 (N.D. Tex. 2020); citation omitted)).

Similarly, the Vallejos have not shown that exceptional circumstances require the appointment of counsel under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1).

Recommendation

The Court should dismiss this lawsuit for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

A copy of these findings, conclusions, and recommendation shall be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of these

findings, conclusions, and recommendation must file specific written objections within 14 days after being served with a copy. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge's findings, conclusions, and recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996).

DATED: March 4, 2024



DAVID L. HORAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE